UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,921	03/13/2006	Stephen B. Murphy	103068-0003U	7285
	7590 04/29/2010 MCKENNA, LLP LCON AVENUE		EXAMINER	
88 BLACK FA			DANEGA, RENEE A	
BOSTON, MA	02210		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3736	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/29/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/565,921	MURPHY, STEPHEN B.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Renee Danega	3736					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>16 April 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) $\boxtimes$ The period for reply expires <u>6</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Aino event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (IMONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS  3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be	but prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	201100				
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);					
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
<ul> <li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ul>		npliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of				
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>3-14</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>15-21</u> .							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation <u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u></li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	try is below or attach	ed.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Max Hindenburg/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3736							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Sarin is aimed at defining an AP plane, and then tracking new points relative to the plane to determine orientation and rotation transformations based on an angle as discussed in [0052] based on an original orientation [0051]. Sarin teaches the measured parameters can be modeled in a coordinate system on a computer [0049] taken to be an image, albeit not a created from a fluoroscopy technique. While Sarin discloses that the method can be performed without taking actual images of the hip as pointed out by applicant, creating models from actual images as performed in DiGioia would create a more realistic and accurate depiction of the surgery relating to the actual body structure aside from just the landmarks, DiGioia teaches that a fluoroscopic imaging device can be used or any number of known imaging devices to create the models from a series of two dimensional scans taken to be the single image (column 8, lines 59-66). DiGioia teaches the transformation registration data to be superimposed on the model originally created during operation (Figures 10a-b). Chen is merely relied upon to provide other known landmarks on the pelvis that may be useful. The point by applicant that DiGioia registers the dataset with actual landmarks on the patient with a nagivation probe is well taken. However, the claims at this time are written in the inclusive form using the word "comprising". As such, they do not exclude such methods giving the claims their broadest reasonable interpretation. Examiner still believes claims 15-21 are drawn to a different invention than the claimed method and apparatus as they are drawn to an executable program for determining a coordinate system. As such, the status indicators on the claims should remain that they are withdrawn frm consideration.